



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/785,022	02/15/2001	Stephen C. Hahn	SUN1726/P5721NP	3012	
22434 7590	12/02/2004		EXAMINER		
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			SHAH, NILESH R		
P.O. BOX 778			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			2127		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/785,022	HAHN, STEPHEN C.
ravious rough	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nilesh Shah	2127
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 11/8/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AT Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment which eal (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the ma		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f).	ire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the perience under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the climely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	od of extension and the corresponding amos of the shortened statutory period for reply Office later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:	
(a)   they raise new issues that would require full	rther consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Not	e below);	
(c)  they are not deemed to place the applicatio issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without cand	celing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE:		·
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) work canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	uld be allowable if submitted in a so	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:	for reconsideration has been cons See Continuation Sheet.	idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	/s:	
Claim(s) allowed: None.		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-33</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a	pproved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Staten		
10. ☐ Other:	•	pur this
	$\mu$	my long

MENG-ALT. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 211

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Mayuyama teaches load measurements for different processors (fig. 1, elements 10,30, 1n, 3n) Mayuyama also teaches the use of triggering one or more actions based on the percent of the load value (col. 4, lines 50-55; col. 5, lines 20-30; col. 6, lines 56-65).

Applicant states improper combination of Pereira and Mayuyama. However Maruymam clearly teaches the need for load measurement, load prediction and controlling distribution of a load for a specific processor (col. 1, lines 28-35; col. 2, lines 33-35; col. 7, lines 1-3).